

EWA "gaming" Stakeholder Briefing
July 12, 2000
1:00-5:00, Room 1131
Draft Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Jason Peltier – CVPWA

David Guy - NCWA

B.J. Miller – SLDMWA

Tom Boardman - SLDMWA

Tina Swanson - The Bay Institute

Walter Bourez - MBK Engineers - upstream interests

Marc Van Camp - MBK Engineers - upstream interests

Jerry Johns - SWRCB

Dave Schuster – KCWA

Jeff Sandberg – SWRI

Laura King – SLDMWA

Dan Fults – SJRGA

Ed Winkler – MWDSC

Jim Snow - WWD

Susan Hoffman – USBR

Noel Williams – USBR

Ann Lubas-Williams USBR

Kellye Kennedy - USBR

Dave Anderson – DWR

Armin Munevar – DWR

John Leahigh – DWR

Jim White – DFG

Paul Forsberg – DFG

Mike Fris – FWS

Dave Fullerton - CALFED

Ron Ott – CALFED

By Phone

Tom Hurlbutt - SWC

Greg Gartrell - CCWD

Dave Briggs - CCWD

Stakeholder questions and suggestions:

1. Does EWA reduce deliveries or affect delivery patterns? Ans: EWA allows shifting of pumping patterns to more fish friendly periods without impacting the overall pumping amounts or delivery patterns.
2. How does ERP water fit into the EWA? Ans: ERP water was not included in the game. It would probably be used much like AFRP water where ½ of it could be recaptured in the Delta unless it's designated not be recaptured then it will contribute to Delta outflow.

3. What is run in the CALSIM monthly model vs what's run in the daily gaming model?
Ans. CALSIM runs serve as the basis for the daily gaming run. CALFED includes everything but JPOD, b(2), and EWA.
4. In the gaming, how are upstream reservoirs accounted for, separate or in one lump?
Ans: Each reservoir is handled as a separate account.
5. Where is interruptible water accounted for? Ans: Interruptible water is included in the CALSIM base run.
6. How frequent is AFRP calculated? Ans: AFRP flows are calculated on a daily basis.
7. What is the priority of EWA water in San Luis Reservoir when San Luis spills? Ans: Project water always has priority in San Luis therefore EWA water always spill first.
8. Has Policy agreed that EWA gaming can use fish salvage at the pumps to trigger EWA actions? Ans: Yes, but they realize that a comprehensive real-time monitoring and evaluation program will be essential to drive future EWA actions. What controls now is T&E take limits at the pumps.
9. Once the CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program is fully on-line, will the main fishery emphasis still be on the EWA water requirements or will it shift more to other non-water measures? Ans: Depends on the effectiveness of water and habitat actions and recovery of the species.
10. Did the gaming lump b(2) and EWA together? Ans: No, tended to spend b(2) on upstream actions first, then use EWA for Delta actions.
11. CALFED senior management seems to be putting a lot of weight on the gaming, was all gaming actions approved by them before the gaming? Ans: Senior management approved the baseline and b(2) assumptions, assets and their general operational use before each game. However, many situations came up in the gaming where assumptions had to be made on issues to complete the game. These issues were flagged for the management. Many are complex and will have to be negotiated. **For example???????????**
12. How much was the EWA allowed to borrow from the Project's water stored in San Luis and when did it have to pay it back? Ans: The EWA had to have sufficient collateral (water it could give to Projects) to payback the Projects borrowed water before it was needed. Usually, this payback was in the same year to avoid a low point problem or in the following year before the low point. The EWA was not allowed to borrow behold its useable collateral.
13. How often was tier 3 water used in the 1981-1994 simulation, and can the amounts be shown in the annual graphics? Ans: Tier 3 water was used in 1982 and 1993.

14. Was a financial analysis conducted on the annual cost of the EWA, especially the water and power cost, if not will it be? Ans: General power and water costs were estimated in the programmatic EIS/EIR. No project specific analysis has been made.
15. How often did we actually pump the groundwater? Ans: Most of the years used the groundwater as collateral so that EWA could borrow from San Luis. In 1982 and 1993 actually used the groundwater to reduce the debt owed to the Projects.
16. How important was it to get the distribution of curtailments and debt allocated between the SWP and CVP to follow the COA? Ans: It was important for the amount of storage in San Luis on the SWP side dictated how much we could use JPOD. The balance was adjusted so that it looked reasonable at the end of each year. Probably need more work to insure COA between the SWP/CVP is balanced.
17. How often did the EWA make water purchases SOD, to what amounts each year, and is management sure we can purchase that amount? (It would be completely unreasonable to assume that 150 TAF is available SOD each year) Ans: Purchased 150 TAF SOD each year except in 1991, where the gamers felt it was so dry that the water would be unavailable.
18. Need to show how much each asset was used and the amount of water the asset produced each year.
19. Was there a through evaluation of b(2) cost. Who covers when the b(2) exceeds 450 TAF cap? Ans: Just kept track of it and reported it to management.
20. Did we shift debt from San Luis to upstream reservoirs? If so how often? Ans: ????
21. May not have the capacity to move EWA water from north to south, especially in wet years.
22. How did we handle 1:1 to 2:1 Delta Smelt for CVP? Ans: The 2:1 export/inflow ratio was met 50% CVP and 50% EWA.
23. Reset, usually so wet that could recapture within the year.
24. Offsets: needs some work left water on the table upstream.
25. How was level 4 refuge water handled? Ans: Assumed that 50 TAF could be bought SOD and 50 TAF NOD. Wet years constrained the transfer of 50 TAF upstream level 4 purchases to SOD.
26. How were salvage figures adjusted? Ans: Used salvage at CVP and SWP. CVP considered 1:1 loss. SWP considered 1:4.3 loss as outlined in Four-pumps agreement.

27. Could the WQCP be flexed to improve fish? Ans: There are some insistences that it could help fish, if it were possible.
28. Need to calculate salvage using fish abundance not just salvage at the pumps.
29. Need to integrate b(2) and EWA with the same set of books.
30. Change pumping patterns certainty can have an adverse impact on drinking water quality, especially at higher pumping rates like 8,500 and 10,300 cfs. The DCCHM must consider the results of the EWA in their deliberations. Should have a complete analysis of EWA and factor it into the DCCHM analysis.
31. Need reconcile use of EWA tools from year to year and the cash flow need to accomplish the purpose and use of EWA.
32. Stakeholders will go back and write-up issues for their managers.